



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/903,743	07/31/1997	TIMOTHY MERRICK LONG	169.0568	2593

5514 7590 09/25/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

08/903,743

Applicant(s)

LONG ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,9-12,16-18,25-29,31-35 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,9-12,16-18,25-29,31-35 and 37-41 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed on 7/15/2002.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 2, 5-6, 8, 13-15, 19-24, 30, and 36 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9-12, 16-18, 25-29, 31-35, and 37-41 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 16, 27-29, 31 and 38-41 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-23, 27-29, 30-31, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judson (Pat. # 5,848,413, 12/8/98, filed on 1/13/95), in view of Yoda (Pat. # 5,848,413, 12/8/98, filed on 1/13/95), further in view of Nielsen (Pat. # 5,761,436, 6/2/98, filed on 7/1/96), in view of Feliciano et al, hereinafter Feliciano (Pat. # 6,052,730, 4/18/00, provisional application filed on 1/10/97) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 7, 26, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judson, in view of Yoda, further in view of Nielsen, further in view of Feliciano, and further in view of Hayashi et al (Pat. # 5,633,996, 5/27/97, filed on 11/8/94) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
5. The rejections of claims 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judson, in view of Yoda, further in view of Nielsen (Pat. # 5,761,436, 6/2/98, filed on 7/1/96), in view of Hunter et al, hereinafter Hunter (Pat. # 5,606,690, 2/25/97) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

6. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9-13, 16-18, 22-23, 26-32, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab et al, hereinafter Nehab (Pat. # 6,029,182, 2/22/00, filed on 10/4/96), in view of Davis et al, hereinafter Davis (Pat. # 5,796,952, 8/18/98, filed on 3/21/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers articles into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67, fig. 9A). Nehab fails to explicitly disclose: *(a) monitoring a user's access patterns to the hyper-text documents and (b) from said monitoring accessing the hyper-text documents including structure information.* However, Davis discloses the creation of a customized web page based upon the monitoring, and tracking of user(s) interest (c.14,L.1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nehab and Davis, because Davis teaches providing customized web pages without the necessity of active involvement.

Moreover, Nehab teaches the compilation, and fetching of a list of hypertext newspaper pages (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67).

Furthermore, Nehab teaches the formatting of the various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document, where the various newspapers are contiguously laid out (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Judson discloses:*the printable document is updated upon new hyper-text pages being accessed*--“....if the user accesses web pages relating to a particular service, the browser may be programmed to identify this access history.....”(Col. 7, lines 29-34). In this quote, Judson teaches the compilation of the user's access history or patterns of hypertext documents as the user accesses new documents.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Judson discloses:*said steps are performed in a background mode relative to the user's access to the hyper-text documents*--“....while the download of the document (and the information object) continues at step 114 as a background process.....”(Col. 9, lines 36-52). Judson is teaching in this quote, that the steps of claim 1 were performed as a background process.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by arranging, and printing various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document of multiple columns (c.14, L.47, and c.16,L.1-67).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Judson discloses:*the printable document comprises a table of contents listing each hyper-text document*--“ history of document information names printed by this apparatus and the print start page numbers”

(Col. 7, lines 27-39). In this quote, Judson is teaching, a history or a table of contents of all the documents printed.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Judson discloses:*hyper-link index of at least one hyper link reference*--“The link information extraction unit 6 extracts link information from the stored document information, and specifies link information indicating a link to the first document information.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-30). In this quote, Judson is teaching, specifying or tagging a link with a cross reference to a corresponding document located in an index or management table.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Judson discloses:*each hyper-link reference in the printable document is tagged with a cross reference to a corresponding entry*--“The link information extraction unit 6 extracts link information from the stored document information, and specifies link information indicating a link to the first document information.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-30). In this quote, Judson is teaching, specifying or tagging a link with a cross reference to a corresponding document located in an index or management table.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Judson discloses:*said hyper-link index comprises all hyper-link references of each hyper-text*--“The link information extraction unit 6 extracts link information from the stored document information, and specifies link information indicating a link to the first document information.....registers the specified link information in the two-way link information management table.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-30). In this quote, Judson is teaching, a table all the two way link relationships of each hypertext document involved in an index or management table.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Judson discloses: *at least one hyper-text document comprises an HTML document.*--“The link information extraction unit 6 extracts link information from the stored document information, and specifies link information indicating a link to the first document information.....registers the specified link information in the two-way link information management table.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-30). In this quote, Judson is teaching, a table all the two way link relationships of each HTML document involved in an index or management table.

Regarding independent claim 16, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67). Nehab fails to explicitly disclose: *forming a single printable document by collating a plurality of hyper-texts documents..... (a) accessing the hyper-text documents including structure information.* However, Davis discloses the creation of customized web pages based upon the monitoring, and tracking of user(s) interest (c.14,L.1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nehab and Davis, because Davis teaches providing customized web pages without the necessity of active involvement.

Moreover, Nehab teaches the collating, and formatting of a list of hypertext newspaper pages (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67).

Furthermore, Nehab teaches the formatting of the various web pages of different newspapers into at least a page, where the various newspapers are contiguously laid out (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67).

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 16, Judson discloses: “....the information object may be automatically or selectively queued to the client printer upon display.....” (Col. 7, lines 46-57). Judson fails to explicitly disclose: *.....at least some of the hyper-texts documents are determined by accepting a specification from a user.....* However, Yoda discloses: “....designating a print operation of desired first document information” (Col. 3, lines 14-34). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Judson and Yoda, because Yoda teaches: “....print a hypermedia document in a format that a user can easily understand.....” (Col. 2, lines 50-51).

Claims 18, and 22 are directed towards a method for carrying out the steps found in claims 9, 13 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 16, the limitations are rejected for the same reasons those limitations were rejected in claim 39 above.

Claim 27 is directed towards a method for carrying out the steps found in claim 16, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 28 is directed towards a computer system for carrying out the steps found in claim 16, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 29 is directed towards a computer readable medium for storing the steps found in claim 1, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 30 is directed towards a computer readable medium for storing the steps found in claim 1, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 31 is directed towards a computer program product having a computer readable medium for storing the steps found in claim 1, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 32, which depends on claim 32, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67). Nehab, and Davis fail to explicitly disclose:*maximizing the number of hyper-text documents on each page*..... However, Hayashi et al disclose: “....searching an area for display or printing to which the contents of the document can be laid out.....” (Col. 3, lines 7-24). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Nehab, Davis, and Hayashi et al, because Hayashi et al teach above search of printable or displayable space the automatic layout of a structured document into a multicolumn document.

Claim 38 is directed towards a method for forming a single printable documents for carrying out the steps found in claim 16, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 39, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers articles into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67, fig. 9A). Nehab fails to explicitly disclose: (a) *monitoring a user's access patterns to the hyper-text documents and (b) from said monitoring accessing the hyper-text documents including structure information*. However, Davis discloses the creation of a customized web page based upon the monitoring, and tracking of user(s) interest (c.14,L.1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nehab and Davis, because Davis teaches providing customized web pages without the necessity of active involvement.

Moreover, Nehab teaches the compilation, and fetching of a list of hypertext newspaper pages (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67).

Moreover, Nehab teaches *displaying the list of accessed documents* (c.15, L.59-c.16,L.67).

Furthermore, Nehab teaches the formatting of the various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document, where the various newspapers follow one another (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67, and c.16,L.1-67).

Regarding independent claim 40, the limitations are rejected for the same reasons those limitations were rejected in claim 39 above.

9. Claims 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab, in view of Davis, and further in view of Hayashi et al (Pat. # 5,633,996, 5/27/97, filed on 11/8/94).

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 32, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67). Nehab, and Davis fail to explicitly disclose:*determining if space exists on a page of the printable document.....if so, inserting the formatted hyper-text document.....* However, Hayashi et al disclose: “....searching an area for display or printing to which the contents of the document can be laid out.....” (Col. 3, lines 7-24). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Nehab, Davis, and Hayashi et al, because Hayashi et al teach above search of printable or displayable space the automatic layout of a structured document into a multicolumn document.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 16, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers

Art Unit: 2176

into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67). Nehab, and Davis fail to explicitly disclose: *....using one of a single or multiple column format and optimizing the number of the hyper-text documents on each page.....* However, Hayashi et al disclose: “....searching an area for display or printing to which the contents of the document can be laid out.....” (Col. 3, lines 7-24). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nehab, Davis, and Hayashi et al, because Hayashi et al teach above search of printable or displayable space the automatic layout of a structured document into a multicolumn document.

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 16, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document (c.3, L.15-c.4,L.67). Nehab, and Davis fail to explicitly disclose: *....using one of a single or multiple column format and optimizing the number of the hyper-text documents on each page.....* However, Hayashi et al disclose: “....searching an area for display or printing to which the contents of the document can be laid out.....” (Col. 3, lines 7-24). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nehab, Davis, and Hayashi et al, because Hayashi et al teach above search of printable or displayable space the automatic layout of a structured document into a multicolumn document.

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 35, Nehab teaches the creation of a personalized document by collating and arranging various web pages of different newspapers into a single printable document (c.2, L.28-67). Nehab, and Davis fail to explicitly disclose: *....documents are formatted within the plural ones of the columns...to continuously reasonably*

Art Unit: 2176

fill each the column..... However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nehab, Davis, and Hayashi et al, because Nehab teach above the automatic layout of a structured document into a multicolumn document as to accommodate the entire structured document into several columns.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Regarding the statement that the newly added limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Judson, Yoda, Nielsen, Feliciano, and Hunter (p.14,L.4-12), the Applicants are referred to the rejection of the newly added features as noted above.

Regarding the remark that prior art does not teach the limitations of claims 16, and 27-29, 31, and 38-41 (p.14,L.18-p.15,L.15), the Applicant is directed towards the rejections of these claims above as necessitated by the current amendment.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. LeMole et al. (Pat. # 6,009,410).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, **except formal After Final communications**)


Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label **“PROPOSED”** or **“DRAFT”**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

9/18/02


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER